It is axiomatic that to anticipate a claim, each element of the claim must be disclosed in a single reference. In regard to claim 1, the Examiner cites the abstract in column 3, lines 4-47 and Figures 1-3 of Komiyama as teaching each of the elements of claim 1. However, the Applicant has reviewed the cited sections of Komiyama and has been unable to discern any part of Komiyama that teaches editing a time based stream of information using at least one edit point. Rather, Komiyama teaches a data transfer display and operation method which reduces the number of operational steps needed and intuitively performs a data transfer operation. See Komiyama, column 1, lines 53-57. Thus, the Applicant believes Komiyama does not teach or suggest any method of editing a time based stream of information including using at least one edit point in such editing. See claim 1, lines 4 and 5. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe Komiyama teaches each element of claim 1. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner more clearly explains or indicates where in Komiyama this element of claim 1 is taught. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 1 are requested.

In regard to claim 2, the Examiner states that Komiyama discloses editing a time based stream of information involving a three point editing between a source media and destination media citing column 4, lines 48-67. However, Applicant has reviewed the cited sections of Komiyama and has been unable to discern any portion of Komiyama that teaches editing a time based stream using a three point edit. Rather, the cited section of Komiyama describes the contents of figures 4-7 of Komiyama which depict text editor and graphic editor windows. Komiyama, column 4, lines 43-58. The Applicant is unable to discern any discussion of time based video stream editing including the use of three-point editing between a source media and a destination media in this description of figures 4-7 or in the figures themselves. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe Komiyama teaches each element of claim 2. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner more clearly explains or indicates where in Komiyama this element of claim 2 is taught. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 2 are requested.

In regard to claims 3-6, these claims depend from independent claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned in regard to claim 1, these claims are not anticipated by Komiyama. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 3-6 are requested.

In regard to claim 7, the Examiner cites column 4, lines 48-67 of Komiyama as teaching a black and coding of a tape in a sequential device. The Applicant has reviewed the cited section of Komiyama and has been unable to discern any section of Komiyama that discusses black and coding of a tape in a sequential device. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe Komiyama teaches each element of claim 7. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner more clearly explains or indicates where in Komiyama this element of claim 7 is taught. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 7 is requested.

In regard to claim 8, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 7-51 of Komiyama as teaching "using a timecode indicator to position a playhead of said sequential storage device" as claimed in claim 8. See claim 8, lines 2 and 3. The Applicant has reviewed the cited section of Komiyama and has been unable to discern any part of Komiyama that teaches using a time code indicator including using a time code indicator to position a playhead of a sequential storage device. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe Komiyama teaches each element of claim 8. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner more clearly explains or indicates where in Komiyama this element of claim 8 is taught. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 8 are requested.

In regard to claim 9, the Examiner cites column 8, lines 7-51 of Komiyama as teaching "using one of a mark in icon and a mark out icon to position a playhead of said sequential storage device. " See claim 9, lines 2 and 3. The Applicant has reviewed the cited section of Komiyama and has been unable to discern any section of Komiyama that teaches using two icons to position a playhead of a sequential storage device. Therefore, the Applicant does not believe Komiyama teaches each element of claim 9. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, it is respectfully

requested that the Examiner more clearly explains or indicates where in <u>Komiyama</u> this element of claim 9 is taught. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 9 are requested.

In regard to claim 10, this claim includes the element of a means for editing the time based stream of information using at least one edit point. As discussed in regard to claim 1, <u>Komiyama</u> does not teach a means for editing a time based stream of information using an edit point. Thus, <u>Komiyama</u> does not teach each element of claim 10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 10 are requested.

In regard to claims 11-23, these claims depend from independent claim 10 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned in regard to claim 10, these claims are not anticipated by <u>Komiyama</u>. Further, claims 11 and 16-18 include elements also included in claims 2 and 7-9, respectively. Therefore, claims 11 and 16-18 are not anticipated by <u>Komiyama</u> for the reasons mentioned in regard to claims 2 and 7-9. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 11-23 are requested.

In regard to claim 24, this claim includes the language "said computing device including a first circuitry configured to edit said time based stream using at least one edit point". Claim 24, lines 8-10, as discussed in regard to claim 1, <u>Komiyama</u> does not teach circuitry configured to edit a time based stream of information using at least one edit point. Thus, <u>Komiyama</u> does not teach each element of claim 24. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 24 are requested.

In regard to claims 25-30, these claims depend from independent claim 24 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned in regard to claim 24, these claims are not anticipated by <u>Komiyama</u>. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 25-30 are requested.

In regard to claim 31, this claim includes the elements of editing a time based stream using at least one edit point. Claim 31, lines 7 and 8. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned in regard

to claim 1, <u>Komiyama</u> does not teach each element of claim 31. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claim 31 are requested.

In regard to claims 32-39, these claims depend from independent claim 31 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned in regard to claim 31, these claims are not anticipated by <u>Komiyama</u>. Further, claims 32 and 37-39 include elements also included in claims 2 and 7-9, respectively. Therefore, claims 32 and 37-39 are not anticipated by <u>Komiyama</u> for the reasons mentioned in regard to claims 20 and 29. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 32-39 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-39 patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207 3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: __5/7__, 2002

Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800